DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 137 HE 000 986

By-Orbach, R.
Request for Funding for the Committee for the Study of Education and Society.
California Univ., Los Angeles.
Pub Date 1 Oct 68
Note-21p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15
Descriptors-*Course Descriptions, *Educational Innovation, *Financial Needs, Higher Education, Integrated Activities, *Relevance (Education), *Social Problems, Student Experience

The Committee for the Study of Education and Society (CSES) was formed in 1966 at the University of California, Los Angeles, to sponsor credit courses or seminars on current social problems. Criteria for the courses stipulate that they: cross departmental lines, provide a mechanism for making higher education relevant to society, possess a high degree of intellectual challenge, be innovative in format and subject material, and be constructed and run by students and instructors in a close working relationship. By 1968, this joint faculty-student-administration committee had offered 10 courses for credit to over 600 students, and almost as many auditors, who were permitted to enroll without regard to major, year, or grade point average. Each course is granted Academic Senate approval by the Council for Educational Development, and the instructors are relieved from 50% of their normal duties through a financial arrangement between their departments and the administration. Some course topics were Alienation, Corruption, The Black Man in a Changing American Context, and The Future of Disarmament. CSES estimates that $3000 per course would provide students with a truly innovative educational experience, and is requesting $18,000 for 6 courses to be offered during the 1969-1970 academic year. Appended to the request are a complete summary of 8 courses, a list of criteria for, and evaluation of, courses and instructors, and a breakdown of enrollment. (WM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.
ED031137

Request for funding for the

COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

R. Orbach

Department of Physics and

Chairman, Committee for the Study of Education and Society

University of California

Los Angeles, California

I. Introduction

About two years ago, a joint faculty-student-administration committee was set up to sponsor courses or seminars for credit studying the current social problems of our society. The criteria for these courses were based on the following provisos: 1.) They freely cross Departmental lines; 2) They provide a mechanism for making University education relevant to our society; 3.) They be innovative in format and subject material; 4.) They possess a high degree of intellectual challenge; and 5.) They be constructed and run by students and instructor, in a close working relationship. Now, two years later, this Committee, named "The Committee for the Study of Education and Society" (CSES) has offered ten (10) courses for credit, with a total enrollment of over 600 students, and an equally large number of auditors. The courses have covered such topics as (CSES 100) "Corruption", (CSES 101) "Alienation", (CSES 102)"The Black Man in a Changing American Context", (CSES 105) "The Concept of Innocence", and (CSES 107) "The Future of Disarmament". A complete summary of the first eight courses (up through CSES 107) is given in Appendix I.

HE 000 986

The CSES itself has evolved into an informal group of students and faculty who meet weekly to discuss either student or faculty originated ideas for courses to be offered for credit under its auspices. The originator of an idea for a course is asked to present a preliminary outline to the group. After some discussion, if the

idea is accepted as being within the purvue of CSES, the originator is asked to bring back to the CSES a more complete outline and a tentative bibliography. At this stage, and after a thorough examination by the Committee of the content of the proposed course, an instructor is sought who will be satisfactory to the person or group who has now essentially organized the course. After the appropriate person is found, he joins with the course organizers, and the CSES, to construct a final outline and bibliography. After this has been satisfactorily completed, the course is then sent to the Council for Educational Development, which has the authority to grant Academic Senate approval. The proposed course is then sent to the appropriate College or School, an appropriate instructional title is obtained for the instructor (if he is not already a faculty member at UCLA. If he is, then he is relieved of one of his own courses through an arrangement with his Department and the Administration). The course is advertized in the campus newspaper, The Daily Bruin, and interested students apply for enrollment, without regard to major, year, or grade point average.

Various courses have selected students in differing ways. The CSES 100 course, "Corruption", advertized for students, contacted some sixty who responded, and asked for essays on their interests and concept of corruption. On the basis of the replies, twenty were chosen by the instructor. The CSES 102 course, "The Black Man in a Changing American Context", was open to all, and ended up with an enrollment of 393. Another course, CSES 109, "War and the Artist" will conduct personal interviews with interested students and chose thirty in this way. There is no rule concerning the number of students in a specific CSES class--this is up to the course organizer and has varied from 4 to 393.

A detailed list of criteria for, and evaluation of, courses and instructors has been constructed by CSES and is contained in Appendix II. Paramount is the desire to cross Departmental lines and to provide a mechanism for making University education relevant to our society. The classic "departmental" structure of the University of California (and most others) is not intended to fulfill this need.

There are a number of interdepartmental units (e.g., the various research institutes) specifically designed to cross departmental lines and work at interface areas in order to concentrate on research problems of current interest. The structure of these research units is quite flexible and is designed to accommodate the particular topic with which the institute is concerned. CSES is a new "interdisciplinary unit" specifically concerned with education. The only other mechanism currently available for this purpose at UCLA is the Interdepartmental Committee. However, these bodies traditionally focus on rather specific goals and have modeled themselves after Departmental structures. Indeed, many have evolved into Departments.

CSES is committed to the examination of a broad spectrum of topics concerning the society in which students find themselves and indeed in which the University must function. It utilizes the very considerable base of knowledge existing within (and outside) the UCLA campus to examine topics which cut across traditional departmental lines.

The cardinal rule of CSES has been innovation. Courses have met at almost every time during the day or evening, classes have been held in a local Monastery, students have participated in a four-day "Simulation" of a crisis originating with nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, and others have become directly involved with labor negotiations and proposed their own solutions. Many of the specifics are given in Appendix I. What is not given there is student reaction. It has been magnificent. A breakdown of enrollment is given in Appendix III. Surely this is the true test of any program. On file are comments indicating that many felt their CSES course(s) was the finest educational experience of their four years at UCLA.

II. Details of Request

As indicated in the Introduction, instructors for CSES courses are relieved half time from their normal Departmental duties by a "grant" of a ½FTE to the Department from the Administration. This means that no damage is done to

Departmental teaching committments, and the instructor of a CSES course does not have to teach his course in addition to his normal instructional duties. Thus, this part of the financial problem has been solved. However, there are others which stem from the fact that CSES is a joint student-faculty Committee, and not a Department. Funds are needed for duplication costs, films, lecturers, field work and a variety of other unforseen expenses. The financial needs of each course are listed in the initial course proposal, but only minimal funds have been found from University sources (e.g. the Simulation referred to earlier cost a token $500 which was contributed by the ASUCLA) which can only be tapped a few times before they give out.

It is the estimate of the CSES that in terms of each course, a budget of $3,000 represents a minimal support figure which could enable the students to participate in a truly innovative experience. Included in this cost-per-course figure are secretarial and T.A. funds, special field work costs, and the usually heavy duplication cost. It is impossible to be more specific at this stage on how the money will be spent for each course during the 1969-70 Academic year, since to do so would imply that rigid formats have already been drawn up. This is not the case. CSES courses have been noted for their flexibility and vitality. There is no single format into which they can be placed.

It is estimated, based on the experience of this last year, that six(6) CSES courses will be offered during the 1969-70 period. Thus, it is requested that

$18,000

be appropriated for its use. This cost of $3,000 per course is a bargain far below the average cost of other courses on campus. The availibility of such funding will enable CSES to provide any interested UCLA student with an exceptional educational experience.

III. Summation

The existence of CSES and its courses has other educational benefits. It prepares the student to assume an active and informed role in society upon graduation. Too often courses seem designed only to prepare students for a professional career in the subject being taught. In fact, very few undergraduates will end up doing professional work in their major. With the opportunities of an interdisciplinary educational unit, they can acquaint themselves with a number of areas of concern to society, guided by men outside their own department, without the usual need for prerequisites and a specific vocabulary. CSES enables students to participate in the choice of topics to be covered, in the selection of the Lecturers, and to take an active role in the classroom for discussion and debate. The faculty itself benefits from the presence of the interdisciplinary courses and seminars. Any faculty member interested in exploring topics covered by the Committee's courses is welcomed to participate actively. The ensuing interchanges have already benefited both students and faculty alike.

It is quite clear that the student's opinions will be influenced by the Lecturers in charge of the class or seminar. This will be true throughout the student's subsequent life. Open and frank debate in the classroom will allow the student to express and develop his opinions concerning issues of importance. The presence, and guidance, of an "expert" or "experts" in the area under investigation will fortify, or destroy, errors of fact. Decisions can then be arrived at, or criticized, in a frank and probably personal manner. CSES courses offer a forum for the individual student to work out his own arguments against a backdrop of enlightened criticism. With proper financial support we can proceed in that direction.

SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATIONS AND SOCIETY.

R. Baker

The Committee for the Study of Education and Society (CSES), approved for one year on an experimental basis by the Committee on Educational Policy, Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division, and sheltered in the College of Letters and Science, has offered seven courses at UCLA since its inception in the Fall, 1967. It is a modest and unique example of an interdisciplinary unit created by faculty and students to explore contemporary problems in experimental manner. The unit was originally designed to offer a structure within which the interdisciplinary nature of these problems could be dealt with, for, as Buckminster Fuller has observed, "the university is composed of departments whereas nature knows no such method of organization." Although the concept of an interdepartmental unit is not new, CSES represents something of a new departure. Departments as such do not direct the CSES, rather its courses are a result of the initiative of interested faculty and students. CSES courses have always been open to UCLA students in all fields at all levels. The fact that these seven courses have attracted over 450 students reflects the varied nature of these offerings as well as the deep student interest in them. Faculty recruitment, although difficult at times, has been facilitated by the freeing of instructors from 1/2 of their regular duties for one quarter, their departments being compensated by 1/2 F.T.E. to compensate for their 1/2 time absence from their normal duties. The CSES courses carry full credit, and satisfy elective requirements. The courses are approved by the Council on Educational Development, The Undergraduate Course Committee and the appropriate college as well.

CSES 100. "Corruption".

Professor David Rapoport of Political Science agreed to direct the first CSES course, CSES 100 titled "Corruption". The course description read: "Corruption and a set of related terms indicating perversion and determination of vital energies. The relationship between physical and moral connotations, and the connections between ordinary language and academic usage will also be discussed." Forty students applied for admission. Their diversity of backgrounds indicates the breadth of the course: the applicants included one freshman, five sophomores, ten juniors, twenty seniors, three graduate students and one post-doctoral student. Ten departments or schools were represented: English (ten), Psychology (seven), Sociology (six), Political Science (five), History (four), Philosophy (three), Anthropology (two) Bacteriology (one), Pre-Med (one) and Engineering (one); students of the Humanities and Social Sciences were about equally attracted, with some 7.5% of the applicants coming from the "hard" sciences.

Each applicant submitted a short essay in which he indicated his own interests and understanding of the concept of corruption. Fifteen students were selected for admission on the basis of these papers, and some attempt was made to retain a diversity of interest and backgrounds. It was mutually decided that the class should meet at night, as often as possible, as long as possible, and away from the university - a suggestion which pleased both the students and CSES. Students persistently complain about the high degree of structure within the university, and CSES felt that it should support different kinds of experiments concerning this problem.

CSES 100's reading list was extremely diverse, including Joseph Conrad's Nostromo, Fyodor Dostoevski's Crime and Punishment, Graham Greene's The Comedians, J.K. Huysmans' Against Nature, and Banfield's Moral Basis of a Backward Society, among others.

To these selections was added Antonioni's famous film, "Blowup", which was discussed over part of a weekend spent at the Dominican monastery at Valyermo, California; the monks themselves led this discussion, in conjunction with their efforts to bring the concept of corruption into theological focus for the seminar. This technique, which Professor Rapoport and his students thought to be extremely valuable, was not repeated, unhappily, because of the physical problem of making arrangements, without a permanent office staff to help the CSES.

Other experimental aspects of the course involved the recruitment of specialists from different fields who delivered short talks to the seminar. The speaker discussed an assigned topic from the point of view of his own discipline. Guests speakers included Professor Susan Downey (Art History), Professor Herbert Fingarette (UCSB, Philosophy), and Professor Robert Gerstein (Law). Robert Baker, T.A. in History, directed a discussion of one of the readings, although this precedent (the use of graduate students) has not generally been followed because it has been CSES policy to employ only faculty personnel.

In evaluating the course the students were asked during the quarter to respond to several specific questions concerning the substance and method of CSES 100. They did not like the procedure of making one student responsible for a formal presentation of the reading, and thought the reading list too long. Both difficulties were then eliminated. Interestingly, the complaint was not that too much was expected of the student but rather there was not enough time to prepare each of the readings carefully. Most thought that the interdisciplinary aspects generated original thought, but the students also opined that the guest speakers were not sufficiently familiar with the previous content of the course to make effectively articulated contributions.

"Closeness" was mentioned by almost every student as the most valuable product of the course. It was felt that by meeting at night and taking the class out of the Monday-Wednesday-Friday rut that each of the students had been given the opportunity to relate to his fellow students on levels other than those upon which students usually relate, such as the level of cut-throat competition. As a consequence, more than half of the meetings lasted for four to five hours. This "Communal sense" gave most of the students an emotional and intellectual investment in the course which was intensified by Professor Rapoport's own skill as instructor. Students commented that this type of involvement is unthinkable in a lecture course, and most felt that CSES 100 was the first course in which they had found this quality.

The pattern of CSES 100 has been used in most of the subsequent CSES courses. Intimacy, flexibility of schedule and the use of "experts" from a variety of fields (disciplines) has been a rather general feature of its course offerings.

CSES 101. "Alienation".

CSES 101, entitled "Alienation", had been planned concurrently with CSES 100, although the former course had to be offered in the Winter quarter of 1967 instead of the Fall quarter because of the absence of Professor Melvin Seeman (Sociology),

who had agreed to direct the course. Professor Seeman, whose reputation is largely based on his studies of the empirical testing of alienation, selected a class slightly larger than that of Professor Rapoport, although the class was not so large that the seminar format had to be abandoned. CSES 101 students were more oriented toward the social sciences than CSES 100 students, but the class was still representative of different departments and disciplines.

Student response was enthusiastic, in spite of the fact that there was relatively more lecturing in CSES 101 than 100. Professor Seeman's students agreed that the interdisciplinary approach and the seminar format made it easier for them to relate to the material and to their fellow classmates than had been the case theretofore in ordinary lecture courses. A minority of students pointed out that they had relatively little role in the planning of the course. This is a serious and valid charge because CSES had always envisioned a significant degree of student involvement in the planning of the course offerings.

CSES 102. "The Black Man in a Changing American Context"

The next course, CSES 102, "The Black Man in a changing American Context" was given as one of four CSES courses in the Spring quarter. Rather than describe it myself, I quote below the description offered by its instructor, Professor R. Kinsman. This course was much larger than any other CSES course offered before or since, and was constructed and run almost entirely by the Black Students Union (BSU). It was an experiment which the CSES was delighted to sponsor. In Professor Kinsman's words:

"It would by no means be pretentious to begin this report with the statement that CSES 102 has passed into local lore as a memorable course. It has already been veiledly alluded to in Time magazine's write-up of Chancellor Charles Young's assumption of office. It was the subject of letters addressed to me by faculty and students alike in far places: Dr. James H. Brewer, Professor of History, North-Carolina College, Durham, North Carolina wrote us in early March to inquire about the course; Robert Verbrugge, President of the "Student Intermediary Board," College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota wrote in inquiry, having been on the UCLA campus in mid-Spring, at which time he had noticed our posters proclaiming the course.

Although it will greatly lengthen my report, it is worth recording the genesis of the course, not only because it involved a prominent member of the Administration, then Vice Chancellor Charles Young, but because it brought student and faculty together to plan it and organize it carefully and creatively. At a time when "Student Power" seemed irresponsibly to mimic certain extremes of the rhetoric of "Black Power" - or so the yellow journalists and jaundiced TV newsmen would have it - this course sprang out of the responsible exertion of student power as notably expressed by the Education Committee of the Black Students' Union and by an equally responsible reaction by"the"Administration in seeking to find a proper place for the course on campus.

As my records run, on February 2nd, 1968, in the Regents Dining Room, the first full planning session for the course was held, presided over by Charles Young, Vice Chancellor. Students attending the meeting were exclusively from the BSU: Eddie Anderson, Beverlee Bruce (a graduate student then in Linguistics), Art Frazier,

Tim Ricks, and Virgil Roberts (Chairman of the BSU's Educational Committee). Four faculty members were present: Tom Robischon of Philosophy (now in Education, presumably present because of his experience in the experimental program at Tuskegee), Leonard Freedman of University Extension and Political Science, Boniface Obichere and Ronald Takaki (both of History), the one a specialist in African History, the other a specialist in Colonial American History . As a result of the session and one or two others like it, the BSU drew up an outline of the course, pretty much as it turned out (see the course outline appended) and established a list of potential instructors, with each member of their Educational committee being assigned the responsibility of making contact with specific people for specific topics. In addition a budget of approximately $5500 was established under Vice Chancellor Park's aegis,(including three black and three white readers), resource material, publicity ($250.00 - blown in a single, full page DB ad and in campus posters).

When all this had been sketched out and quite firmly shaped at that - and only then, when things were in penultimate form at least - was I involved as "an authority figure", an informal title that I formally rejected on several grounds, preferring the more appropriate designation of "O.B." - "Old Bahstud," an appelation at least honest and oft-honored if possibly less dignified.

The rest was relatively easy. The course began on time, although incepted and approved too late for appearance on the Registrar's schedule. Dean Franklin Rolfe of L & S and Vice Chancellor Rosemary Park were most prompt in clearing the course for credit. Although there were switches necessitated in the arrangement of topics, necessitated by such unforseeable emergencies as a change of performance date that forced the entertainer Oscar Brown Jr. (a splendid "lecturer" by the way) to appear on April 11th rather than May 2nd and a shift in lecture dates elsewhere which brought Professor Maurice Jackson to us a week later than planned, the course adhered pretty much to schedule, nonetheless, and by and large found its speakers most generous in their own sacrifice of convenience. Most of them were black people tremendously busy in the community, "theirs" or the wider community ("ours"). Considering the terrible facts that jarred this course - the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr, and Robert Kennedy - we were most fortunate to have the speakers appear as arranged, with the exception of two city councilmen, the Honorable Thomas Bradley and Billy Mills. In view of recent events, it is doubly ironic to record the absence of Eldridge Cleaver as a panelist; he was literally not free to appear.

The course outline speaks for itself, arranged historically in theme and time, from African backgrounds to the Black Ghetto, its particular problems and their impact on the geographically wider white community. Every effort was made to secure black lecturers or panelists, whether poets or psychiatrists, sociologists, economists or historians. In fact, with the exceptions of Professor Takaki - an Hawaiian born Nisei - and Professor Raymond Murphy, a Caucasian who had contributed much to the study of Watts after the Riot, every speaker was black. Sharply dissident voices were heard, but not exclusively and had they been heard, exclusively, I am not certain that the 375 undergraduates and 22 graduates who took the course for credit (a number swelled by the 50-75 auditors who sat in the aisles or stood in the halls) could have been "brainwashed", for they had opportunity to express themselves in a term paper read by readers under my supervision. In addition, they had the opportunity of writing a "take-home" final (see appendix "B") again read under my supervision.

Since the students were divided approximately 60% white, 33% black, 7% Mexican and Oriental - or so my guess would run - it might be of interest to register some of their reactions. One student, Birmingham born, and a Howard graduate, told me that she was overwhelmed that so many white students could be interested. Another black student, Philadelphia born and a Temple graduate said that he felt he could face a class with pride and confidence now that he had participated in a class run by negroes who could command academic respect. An Oriental student remarked that she could not share directly in the spontaneous reactions of the black students but nonetheless shared some of their suspicions of "The Man" and rejoiced vicariously when a black could do something to redress old wrongs and more nearly restore balance.

That the course was a sort of psychological testing ground would be hard to deny. Some of the white students sat in the course to overcome lifelong fears through controlled exposure, I am convinced. Some persisted out of a mixed sense of guilt and fascination, aware of "racism" in others and tormented to discover traces of racism in themselves and conceivably in some of the actions of the BSU.

For example, after the "Rope" episode, when LeRoi Jones replaced the panel scheduled to discuss Styron's The Confessions of Nat Turner and his appearance was heralded by a rope's being stretched across the auditorium (black in front, white in back), only a few white students dropped out for fear or anxiety; two or three were enraged at the violation of their civil rights but most of them got the point readily and played it cool. The Rope trick made a very deep impression, beyond doubt, and was a most effective, if potentially dangerous device, characteristic of the quality of controlled reaction that this course distinctly radiated (or so I say, at the risk of an obvious pun.)

All of this is not to deny that the course had subject matter content as well as emotional and psychological encounter and exploration. The papers, carefully annotated but generously graded, showed dedication, devotion and high intelligence. Some of the better papers could have served as useful documents in a sort of Urban Coalition study series on the Inner City and its various aspects as seen in terms of "Black Reality": schools; ethnic solidarity (its need its nemesis); White Racism; the Ghetto and its problems of community communication; Soul Music; The Society for the Preservation of True Spirituals; The Black Churches and Contemporary Black Rhetoric.

One can not come away from having "coordinated" this course without the feeling that for the first time "unique" could be proved, to all concerned, incapable of qualification.

"The Black Man in a Changing American Context"

Committee for the Study of Education and Society CSES 102
2100 Dickson Art Center Auditorium, T, Th, 2-3:30 p.m.

Robert S. Kinsman
Coordinator

Spring 1968

Thursday, March 28	Orientation	Robert S. Kinsman, Professor of English, Assoc. Dean, Graduate Division, UCLA
Tuesday, April 2	"West Africa and the Slave Trade"	Boniface Obichere, Visiting Ass't. Professor, History, UCLA
	"The Slave Trade and the Creation of the American Negro"	Ronald Takaki, Ass't. Professor, History, UCLA
Thursday, April 4	Panel: "History of Racism in Western Civilization"	Professors Obichere and Takaki
Tuesday, April 9	"The Meaning of Black Power"	Harry Truly, Ass't. Professor, Sociology, California State College, Los Angeles
Thursday, April 11	"The Effect of Black Power on Black Music"	Oscar Brown, Jr., Composer and Musician
Tuesday, April 16	"Social Stratification in the Black Community"	Raymond Murphy, Assoc. Professor, Sociology UCLA
Thursday, April 18	"Post-Colonial African Literature"	John Povey, Assoc. Professor, English and African Studies, UCLA
Tuesday, April 23	"Changing Values in the Black Community"	Maurice Jackson, Ass't. Professor, Sociology UCR
Thursday, April 25	"Changing Values in Current Black Literature"	John Stewart, Ass't. Professor, English, Fresno State College
Tuesday, April 30	Three Contemporary Black Poets Reading from their poetry	Michael Harper, Instructor in English Contra Costa Jr. College Emmery Evans, Watts Writers Workshop Vallejo Kennedy, Watts Writers Workshop

Thursday, May 2	Panel: "The Image of the American Negro from Black and White Perspectives" with discussion centered on William Styron's Confessions of Nat Turner Alfred Cannon, Ass't. Professor in Residence, Psychiatry, UCLA
Tuesday, May 7	"Consumption Patterns Among Minorites" Marcus Alexis, Assoc. Professor, Economics and Business Administration, University of Rochester, Kenneth B. Clark as "Respondent"
Thursday, May 9	Panel: "Problems of Education in the Black Community" Sol Cohen, Ass't. Professor, Education, UCLA Wendell Jones, Professor, Education UCLA Everett Wells, Director, Mid-City Tutorial
Tuesday, May 14	Presentation: "Economics in South Central Los Angeles Prior to August 1965" Robert Singleton, PhD Candidate, Economics, UCLA
Thursday, May 16	Presentation: "Economics in South Central Los Angeles After August 1965" Lou Smith, Founder, Co-Director, "Operation Bootstrap"
Tuesday, May 21	Panel: "'Law and Order' and the Black Community" Earl Anthony, BA Political Science, USC; Graduate of Hastings Law School, UCB; Activist, Black Panther Party for Self-Defense Thomas Bradley, Los Angeles City Councilman, Attorney, Former Police Lieutenant, L.A. City Police Donald T. Warden, Attorney-at-Law, Director, Black Studies Program, Oakland, California Richard Wasserstrom, Professor of Law and Professor of Philosophy, UCLA
Thursday, May 23	Panel: "The Relevance of Urban Coalition Politics to the Black Community" Donald G. Hagman, Assoc. Professor of Law, Ass't. Director, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, UCLA Yvonne Brathwaite, Member of the Assembly Leon Ralph, Assemblyman, 55th District, California State Assembly Harry Scoble, Assoc. Professor, Political Science, UCLA (on tape)
Tuesday, May 28	Rev. James Hargett, "Black Religion"
Tuesday, June 4	"A Glass House Shattered" - a Sensitivity Drama by Players of "Operation Bootstrap," Los Angeles

"The Black Man in a Changing American Context"

Reserve Reading List

Achebe, Things Fall Apart; Man of the People

A La Guma, A Walk in the Night

Babcock and Bosselman, Citizen Participation: A Suburban Suggestion for the Central City, 32 Law and Contemporary Problems, p. 220 (1967)

Bontemps (ed.), American Negro Poetry

* Carmichael, Stokeley and Charles Hamilton, Black Power

* Clark, Kenneth B., Dark Ghetto

Cleaver, Eldridge, Soul on Ice

Comer, James, "Social Power of the Negro," Scientific American, 4 (1967)

* Fanon, Franz, The Wretched of the Earth

Kohl, Herbert, 36 Children, New American Library

Kozal, Jonathan, Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hearts and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools

* Malcolm X Autobiography

Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma

"The Negro American" (Special Issue) Daedalus Winter 1965, (later published as separate book ed. Talcott Parsons & Kennth B. Clark)

Nordholt, J.W. Schulte, The People that Walk in Darkness

Paton, Alan, Cry the Beloved Country

* Silberman, Charles, Crisis in Black and White

Styron, William, The Confessions of Nat Turner

* U.S. President's Commission on Urban Unrest: Report of Commission

William, Eric, Capitalism and Slavery

Wyndham, H.A., The Atlantic and Slavery

* Required Reading

CSES 103 "The Japanese-American"

Black-power movements have contributed to the heightened self-awareness of other minority groups, and this is as true on the UCLA campus as it is in urban areas. CSES 103. "The Japanese-American", was designed to appeal to the largest student minority group on campus, but it is indicative of the degree of awareness of this minority that the course was proposed by Dean Richard Moyer (Assistant Dean of Students) and taught by Professor Robert Wilson (History), neither of these men being of Japanese-American descent. Fifty-two students applied for entrance into this Spring quarter course, of whom only eight were "anglos", and nineteen were finally selected, and all but one of Japanese-American ancestry.

The history of development of the Japanese-American community in the United States was discussed in a series of lectures by Professor Wilson, after which the course was opened to a series of speakers, most of whom were UCLA and SFVSC faculty, although professional men from the Japanese-American community were brought in as well. These visiting lecturers spoke on a number of topics meant to give a general picture of the Japanese-American; to this end, the economic and social values of this minority were outlined, the difference in generations was analyzed, and the role of the minority as a minority group in the political arena was discussed. If the major question asked in the course was "Where is the Japanese-American going?", the answer was very uncertain. Whatever the amount of knowledge each student inculcated (and the papers submitted at the end of the course indicate that the amount varied greatly), it became clear that the Japanese-American student does not have a very keen awareness of his own status as a member of a minority group. Some students seemed disturbed by the course, as if they were beginning to explore an aspect of their lives heretofore ignored; perhaps this fact alone justified the offering of the course. The majority of the students agreed that further courses should be made available for their own use, and that this introductory course should be preserved and expanded in order to accept a larger number of Japanese-Americans.

CSES 104 "Unionism and Collective Bargaining."

CSES 104, "Unionism and Collective Bargaining" was one of the even more experimental offerings. Professor Arthur Carstens (Director of the Institute for Industrial Relations), coordinated this course which was designed to fill a gap in the training of those students interested in labor and management. Students who focus on these areas seldom get an interdisciplinary exposure, and they rarely have experimental contact with the processes which they study. Accordingly, four students were chosen to pursue specific topics related to their academic interests. Generally, topics were selected which related to problems arising in contract negotiations, and hiring practices between unions and industries whose contracts were being negotiated during the Spring quarter. These students sat in on both union and industry board meetings and presented their finding to each of the negociators. The students then followed the discussion of their own recommendations in the bargaining sessions and drew up summary studies of their work which were presented at the conclusion of the course. The class met periodically during the quarter to discuss findings and

to assist one another. It is indicative of the success of the course, from the students' point of view, that some wished to pursue their studies independently into the Summer quarter. To indicate the diversity of interests in this class, studies ranged from a followup on Catholic priests who wished to organize, to an investigation of the attempts of a group of airline machinists to negotiate a wage commensurate with their skills and responsibilities.

CSES 105. "Innocence".

The first five CSES offerings were open to all students, and the interdisciplinary features of each of these courses followed CSES policy regarding breadth. This policy, however, was revised in response to the presentation of a course proposed by Professor Gerald Goldberg (English). Prior to coming to UCLA Professor Goldberg had given a very successful "pro-seminar" for freshman in the English program at Dartmouth College, and he sought an opportunity to experiment with the format at UCLA. CSES decided that, in so far as it concerns itself with academic innovation, it should not rule out experiments which cannot be undertaken by specific departments. The English Department at UCLA is confronted by certain physical limitations concerning availability of classrooms and staff which restrict its ability to experiment, so that CSES agreed to underwrite Professor Goldberg's proposed offering. Accordingly, ten students were selected out of the English 1 and 2 programs with the help of Professor Ronald Freeman (Director of Freshman English) to participate in the pro-seminar. Those students were selected on the basis of the quality of their past performances in composition courses.

This last of the four CSES Spring quarter offerings, CSES 105, "The Fate of Innocence", took its name from the required text used by the students, an anthology edited by Professor Goldberg for use by the Dartmouth seminar. Papers were delivered on assigned topics during the weekly meetings, and those who were not presenting a paper on a given day were asked to submit critiques of the assigned research. Each student submitted two five-to-ten page papers and a longer term paper; the short papers ranged, for example, from a discussion of the imaginery of innocence in Blake's "Songs of Innocence" and its relation to childhood to an analysis of Milton's use of the pastoral tradition in his treatment of the fate of innocence in the masque Comus.

An art historian, a musicologist and a psychologist were brought in as guest lecturers to present ideas from their own area of expertise. Both the instructor and the students found these lectures useful in understanding the concept of innocence, and in some cases students used these lectures to help themselves isolate a term paper topic of an interdisciplinary nature. Professor Goldberg, however, regretted that the course was not a two-quarter offering. He felt that in one quarter he had just prepared the groundwork for potentially interesting research. The students, on the other hand, were so pleased with the course that they drew up a petition asking that the course be made a regular offering. The response of the English Department was ambiguous, in that the Department was pleased by the success of the course but felt unable to use the experiment as a model for reform owing to the persisting physical limitations of space, time and staff noted above.

CSES 106 "The Kerner Riot Commission Report: Follow-up

The Summer offering CSES 106, "The Kerner Riot Commission Report: Follow-up" (CSES 106), was a by-product of post mortem discussions concerning CSES 102. Students who enrolled in the Summer quarter course were expected to examine certain of the recommendations made by the Kerner Commission referential to housing, education and employment in the ghetto community. They went out into the field - specifically, areas such as Watts, Compton, Pacoima and Venice - to examine new or projected projects. Some of the seven enrolled students were residents of these communities, and an effort was made to recruit students regardless of major or level on the basis of their interest in ghetto problems. Had there been an over-subscribed enrollment, ghetto residents would have been favored.

The students were guided in their research by a team of high-ranking faculty who were themselves active in the communities mentioned above. The field work which these faculty members directed was summarized by each student in a lenghty paper submitted at the conclusion of the course. To facilitate the students' work, a series of lectures were prepared by the Survey Research Laboratory discussing the methodology of empirical research, e.g. interviewing techniques, sampling methods, reliability and validity measures, etc. Unfortunately, these meetings were poorly attended, though the papers which were submitted at the end of the course were in most cases excellent. The course began with a discussion about the Kerner Report led by Victor Palmieri, Deputy Director of the Kerner Commission, and was concluded with a series of seminars in which the papers were mutually examined by the members of the seminar to compare projects in different areas directed at the same problem and projects in the same area directed at different problems. This course, coordinated by Professor Donald Hagman (Law), is the second field-study course, sponsored by CSES, being similar in some respects to Professor Carstens' Labor Relations course in that it established further relations between our large urban university and the surrounding urban complex.

In summary, seven courses were offered in the first year of CSES's existance. They were not all uniformly successful (some criticism has arisen over the attendance problem and the subsequent difficulty of UCLA supervision of the student performance, as mentioned above in CSES 106), but this is to be expected in any program so experimental as this one is. Almost all of the students who took the seven courses (and a number of auditors) remarked that they felt they had received a unique educational experience. Many said it was the best course they had ever taken at UCLA (and some of these were seniors!).

As to the future, CSES is offering yet another course this Fall, CSES 107, "The Future of Disarmament" led by Professor Orbach (Physics) and Zoppo (Political Science). Over 45 students enrolled in the course and its format and teaching techniques are quite unusual. For example, the last week of the quarter will be spent (4 evenings) at the S.D.C. computer simulation facility where a disarmament conference will be simulated with students taking the roles of the negociators. In addition, new courses are being

planned, one such being "War and its effect on the artist." As before, faculty and students are meeting on a regular basis to present outlines and discuss ideas for courses.

CSES does need help for the future in terms of funds for the support of experiments conducted in its courses (the computer simulation will cost $500) but the amounts involved are trivial compared to what the students receive in the way of educational experience. The University is getting a remarkable "bargain." These courses give the student a unique opportunity to make use of the resources around him, both within UCLA and outside in the community. CSES offers a way in which the student can learn to study and deal with problems facing contemporary society-problems which do not obey the strictures of a departmental organization.

Appendix II

Committee for the Study of Education and Society

Criteria for courses:

1) Does the course make use of the University's resources to study a current social problem (or problem of society) in depth?

2) Is the course truly interdisciplinary?

3) Could the course be offered in an existing Department?

4) Is the course so structured as to include a substantive and/or a methodological approach to the problem? Is this approach appropriate? Is it clearly delineated?

5) Is the course of interest to a significant number of students and faculty?

6) Is the proposed instructor competent to operate in an interdisciplinary manner? Should he be joined by others?

7) Is there a substantial body of literature which can be drawn upon during the course of the investigation?

Questions for evaluation:

Has there been:

1) Additions to knowledge
2) Synthesis, compilations of categories into generalizations
3) Critical evaluation of ideas
4) A real individual experience of participation, enlightenment and enjoyment
5) Has this kind of interdisciplinary investigation opened up new horizons for further investigation on part of both instructor and students

Techniques for evaluation:

1) Student self evaluation at the end of the course, to be compared with statement made at beginning of course. These statements would be concerned with student's ideas concerning the problem, methods of attack and possible solutions. Have they been excited by the course? Have they felt that they have put out enough?

2) Critical reading of student papers on aspects of the problem under investigation.

3) Statement from the instructor indicating the progress he thinks the students have made. A comparison of this progress with that in his own Department or of a similar group investigating a similar topic.

4) Student evaluation of the instructor(s) and his techniques, insights, methodology, and ability to synthesize, in line with similar evaluations that exist now.

5) How does the course methods and approach differ from the Instructor's own course in his Department?

Appendix III

CSES COURSES ENROLLMENT

CSES 100 CORRUPTION

D. Rapoport, Fall 1967

TOTAL	FRESH	SOPH	JR.	SR.	GRAD. AND OTHERS
14	1	1	6	3	3

CSES 101 ALIENATION MODERN SOCIETY

M. Seeman, Winter 1968

17	0	0	4	10	3

CSES 102 BLACK MAN IN A CHANGING AMERICAN CONTEXT

R. Kinsman, Spring 1968

393	56	76	117	121	23

CSES 103 JAPANESE AMERICAN

R. Wilson, Spring 1968

20	4	4	3	5	4

CSES 104 PROBLEMS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

A. Carstens, Spring 1968

4	0	0	0	3	1

CSES 105 FATE OF INNOCENCE

G. Goldberg, Spring 1968

11	10	1	0	0	0

CSES 106 KERNER RIOT COMMISSION REPORT

D. Hagman, Summer 1968

7	0	1	3	2	1

CSES 107 THE FUTURE OF DISARMAMENT

R. Orbach and C. Zoppo, Fall 1968

46	4	6	21	13	2

CSES 108 A SYMPOSIUM ON WOMEN IN OUR AGE

S. Tucker, Winter 1969

Approx. 128	UNKNOWN AS YET

TOTALS 640

Budget Request

Academic year 1969-1970

Cost per CSES course (includes secretary, T.A. assistance, travel expense of speakers, field work costs, movies, duplication costs)	$3,000
x six (6) courses	
Total Cost	$18,000

Note: UCLA provides 1/2 F.T.E. for each course, equal to approximately $2,000 per course, or a total UCLA instructional contribution of $12,000 for the six (6) courses to be offered next year.